E 415
.9
.V2 S5
Copy 1

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
1800

Class E415

Book M95

VALANDIGHAM'S RECORD REVIEWED.

A POLITICAL TRAITOR UNMASKED.

Speech by Hon. JOHN SHERMAN, U. S. Senator from Ohio

Delivered at Delaware, Ohio, July 28th, 1863.

FELLOW CITIZENS:—The political campaign in Ohio this season presents some singular features. We are in the midst of a great civil war, in which, it is safe to say, there are one million of men arrayed in arms against each other. There are, perhaps, from the State of Ohio, one hundred thousand of her best and bravest citizens in the field, in hospitals or in camp, sharing the dangers of war. The immediate stake involved is nothing less than national existence, while the ultimate stake involves nothing less than civil liberty for generations yet to come. In the midst of this contest the Democratic party, through its most eloquent orators, endeavors to make a personal issue.

They propose to withdraw our armies, to abandon the war, and to try the question whether their candidate for Governor has been legally convicted as a traitor to his country. We are assured by Mr. Pugh, the Democratic candidate for Lieutenant Governor, who is one of the most eloquent and talented young men in the State, that in Ohio we have been subjected to a tyrany as intolerable as that of King Bomba of Naples. When we are asked for evidence of this tyranny, we are told that Clement L. Vallandigham has been illegally convicted and illegally banished, and that if we are fit to be free we must stop and examine the record in his case, and not be turned from it by clamors about prosecuting the war or of concluding peace; and we are told that if we do not do all this we are helpless slaves, and deserve no better fate. Now, as I do not desire to be a slave, nor wish the people of my native State to be slaves, I will so far depart from my course in political discussion as to examine the personal issue thus made. I had supposed, fellow-citizens, that no where in the wide world did people live so free from oppression as in the State of Ohio. But the Democratic party has sounded the alarm that our liberties are jeopardized in that Mr. Vallandigham has, as they assert, been illegally convicted and banished. I now propose to consider that question before alluding to matters of more general interest.

A CONVICTED TRAITOR.

The candidate of the Democratic party was convicted by a military tribunal for aiding the enemy with whom we are at war; for this he was expelled beyond our lines, and was within the lines of the enemy when nominated for Governor of Ohio. By the judgment of a military tribunal, composed mainly of his political friends, approved by Gen. Burnside, the chief officer within the State, sanctioned by Judge Leavitt—a judge selected by Vallandigham himself—of the United States Court, he was convicted and senteneed to imprisonment during the war. By the merey of the President he was released from imprisonment and sent beyond our lines. *While thus banished as a convicted traitor, by a military authority, the Democratic party of the State of Ohio nominated this man as a candidate for Governor, and you are called upon to ratify, and confirm that nomination—to entrust this man, convicted as a traitor, with the chief command*

E4-1 .9 V2 5

of our militia, the appointment of all its officers, and the management of the executive authority of the State, and that, too, in the midst of a war with the rebels he was convicted of aiding.—Now, fellow-citizens, this is a startling proposition. I am surprised that a party could be found in Ohio to make such a nomination. Yet they had the right to make it. It is for the people of Ohio to say what shall be done with it. It will require some forbearance for the brave soldiers who are now exposing their lives to the bullets of the enemy, to discuss the nomination, and I admit that it tries the patriotic citizens to discuss it with good temper. Yet the men who make the nomination had the right to make it. They had the right to nominate Jeff. Davis, Breckinridge, or any other rebel; or they might have initiated a practice become common in Europe, and selected a Greek or other Prince. [Laughter.] The Constitution of the State does not limit even a citizen of the State to hold the office of Governor. Let us, then, exercise our right to examine and discuss the reasons for this extraordinary nomination. And here, before proceeding, I will state that if there is any candid man here who desires to ask any question touching this matter, I shall be most happy to listen to him and to answer his questions to the best of my ability.

THE LAW IN THE CASE.

It is said that Mr. Vallandigham has been illegally convicted, and therefore we must make him Governor. The familiar provisions of the Constitution of the United States protecting the personal liberty of the citizen by trial by jury are quoted. With the same application no rebel soldier could be shot without trial by jury; no daserter could be arrested without a hearing before a judge; no spy could be hung except upon conviction by petit jury. War has its laws as well as peace. They are entirely consistent with, yet independent of each other. Each has its offices, its tribunals and its forms of trial. The civil laws prescribe civil offenses and the mode of punishment, but these laws do not apply to military offenses committed at the time of the war, nor is it possible to define the latter class of offenses with the precision of civil laws and tribunals. The general rule may be stated, that any obstruction to the military operations, is an offense to be overcome and punished by military force or military tribunals, as according to the usages of modern warfare. In the execution of this rule in time of war, military authority and military tribunals are not substituted in the place of civil laws and courts.

This is the law which all good citizens and courts are bound to recognize during war. Now that I may not state a wrong legal proposition, I will venture to read to you from a law book—from Halleck's International Law.

"When a military force is called out to repel invasion or suppress a rebellion, it is not placed under the direction of the judiciary, but under that of the Executive. Suppose the military force, legally and constitutionally called into service for the purposes indicated, should find it necessary, in the course of its military operations, to occupy a field or garden, or destroy trees, or houses belonging to some private persons, can a court, by injunction, restrain them from committing such waste? It can do so in the time of peace, and if its powers are to continue in time of war, the judiciary and not the Executive will command the army and navy. The taking or destroying of private property in such cases is a military act, an act of war, and must be governed by the laws of war; it is not provided for by the laws of peace. In the same way, a person taken and held by the military forces, whether before, or in, or after a battle, or without any battle at all, is virtually a *prisoner of war.*—No matter what his alleged offence, whether he is a rebel, a traitor, a spy or an enemy in arms, he is to be held and punished according to the *laws of war*, for these have been substituted for the laws of peace."

Now, my friends, I have thus read you the law from a law book which is recognized as authority in all the courts. It states distinctly that if a person is arrested, whether he be a rebel, a traitor, a spy or an enemy in arms, he is to be held and punished by the laws of war and by the tribunals of war. It may be that in the execution of this rule the executive or military branch of the Government has, in some cases, exercised its authority where we deem it unnecessary and impolitic. During war much must be left to military discretion. Judge Hall endeavored to aid the British in 1815. General Jackson promptly suppressed him. Vallandigham was actively aiding the public enemies; he interfered with military authority, and General Burnside arrested him and expelled him beyond our lines. Both acts have been denounced as tyrannical and impolitic. Both would be denounced by

the civil laws in time of peace—both are justified by the laws of war in time of war. If in time of war the acts of the citizens plainly aid the public enemy, or obstruct any of the necessary operations of the general, he must suppress them. The danger must be immediate, palpable and pressing, and the acts complained of amount to an obstruction of military authority. So General Burnside regarded the acts and speeches of Mr. Vallandigham, and for these he was tried by the only tribunal known to military law. Let us look at the facts.

PROCEEDINGS OF MILITARY AND CIVIL COURTS.

Gen. Burnside was charged by the President with the defense of Ohio, Kentucky and Indiana. Armed enemies were making forays within his military district, killing, robbing and plundering our citizens. He had to depend upon his soldiers and such citizens as could be induced to enlist to repel and overcome these enemies. But for his army guerrillas under John Morgan and other rebel chiefs could have overrun the whole of the States of Kentucky, Indiana and Ohio, spreading everywhere the horrors and desolations of war. When Vallandigham was arrested there were open and secret organizations within this State to induce our soldiers to desert, to protect them from arrest and to prevent enlistments.—This was known to Gen. Burnside, and to every other citizen. Vallandigham was actively engaged exciting hostility to the Government, to the war, and to all constituted authorities. [Hear, hear.] He had made himself infamously prominent in opposing every measure of national defense. The true instincts of the rebels and of all at home who were organized to resist the law, pointed him out to them as their friend and associate. The sure instincts of every loyal soldier in our army pointed him out as their enemy. [Applause.] Cunning, malignant, and yet covering his operations with the forms of law, he was doing all that one man could to aid the rebels in their attempt to overthrow the Government. [Applause.]

On the 13th of April last, Gen. Burnside issued General Order No. 38, notifying that all persons within our lines "who commit acts for the benefit of the enemies of our country will be tried as spies and traitors." After specifying different military offenses that would be punished, he says: "The habit of declaring sympathy for the enemy will not be allowed in this Department. Persons committing such offenses will be at once arrested with a view of being tried as above stated, or sent beyond our lines into the lines of their friends." A few days after this order was issued, and when it was well known, Mr. Vallandigham went to Mt. Vernon and made a speech. Upon that speech he was accused, or charged, in the ordinary form of a military accusation, "with publicly expressing sympathy for those in arms against the Government of the United States, and declaring disloyal sentiments and opinions *with the object and purpose* of weakening the power of the Government in its efforts to suppress an unlawful rebellion." On this charge he was tried before a court mainly composed of his political friends, and not one member of which he objected to. The trial was open, witnesses were examined on both sides, the facts were plain, simple and scarcely controverted, and he was found GUILTY. Guilty of what? Of aiding the public enemy in a time of war, and of obstructing our military authorities in suppressing the rebellion. He was guilty of precisely the offense of John Morgan, Jeff. Davis and other rebels, except that his manner of rendering "aid and comfort" to the public enemy was less dangerous to him personally than theirs. [Applause.]

A SOLDIER'S DUTY.

Now what was the duty of Gen. Burnside under these circumstances? Should he allow this man to escape and take some poor dupe who, through ignorance and the influence of his leader, would probably go beyond the terms of civil law? Should he allow this man, so determined in his schemes of treason, to subvert his law and stir up sedition and strife among ourselves? ["No; no."] There was no doubt of this man's guilt. He believed these acts plainly obstructed his measures of defense. He considered them far more injurious than the open acts of murder and robbery committed by the rebels—far worse than the desertion of a soldier—meaner than the act of a spy. [Cheers.] Should he be turned over to the civil courts to be tried some time in the future for treason, and in the meantime free to sap and mine the authority of the Government? What do the rebels do with loyal people under like circumstances? They hang them to the nearest tree. What would they do to Governor Andrew Johnson—that loyal man, that honest patriot—if he should speak for the Union to his neighbors in East Tennessee. We know by the fate

of thousands of brave men. And yet this convicted traitor of ours, by the humanity of our Government, is simply placed in safety beyond our lines!

THE POWER OF THE CIVIL COURTS.

But it is said his offense was committed in a region where the courts are open and the ordinary course of the civil law is undisturbed. There are many offenses that may be punished by military authority even in the midst of the most peaceful communities. The breach of discipline of a camp, the act of a spy, the desertion of a soldier, an attempted riot or mutiny, and many similar offenses, are properly punished by military authority even in the presence of a civil court. The boundary between these classes of offenses is not and cannot be accurataly defined; nor is there any danger to our liberties from this military power. The accused may apply to a judge of competent jurisdictien for the benefit of the writ of *habeas corpus*. The judge must then determine whether the writ has been legally suspended, and whether the offense is a military or civil one. This was done in the case of Mr. Vallandigham. Judge Leavitt, of the United States Court, after a full hearing, decided that the accusation was one under the jurisdiction of the military tribunals, and the writ was therefore denied.—The Court was one of his own choosing. He could have applied to Judge Taney or Judge Swayne, but he choose Judge Leavitt, and the decision was against him—that his conviction was legal.

SUPPOSE HIM ILLEGALLY CONVICTED—WHAT THEN?

I will not, fellow-citizens, pursue the argument as to the legality of the arrest and conviction of Mr. Vallandigham any further.

It is my conviction, after examining the question dispassionately, that the proceedings were legal and necessary in time of war. But I want to go a little further.—Suppose him illegally convicted of aiding the rebels, will you therefore make him Governor of Ohio? ["No, no."] Will you trust a thief who was irregularly convicted with the custody of your property? Will you trust a murderer who, upon a writ of error, is discharged for defects in the indictment with the defence of your person? Will you trust a traitor who can be proven even by one witness to be guilty, with your political power? ["No, no."] Then let not the men who, by the election of Vallandigham, are endeavoring to put the Executive power of Ohio on the side of the rebels, cheat you by a false pretense. [Applause.]

WILL YOU INSULT THE SOLDIERS AND DISGRACE THE STATE?

Ohio has won immortal honor in this war. The principal heroes of the war were born and nurtured on her soil. She has sent one hundred thousand brave men into the field to defend the National Union. Every battle-field has been made classic with the blood of these brave men. Scarcely a family in the State but is represented. *And yet you propose to make the Governor, the Commander-in-Chief—the chief Executive officer of these men, and of all the militia of our State, a man who is the friend of their enemies, who refused to vote a man or a dollar for their support. You reserve your highest honor to a man who is a hero to every rebel regiment, and who dare not go before a single regiment of his own State!* Voices—"Shame!"] And why? Because you say he has been illegally convicted of aiding those rebels. Well, what of it? Can you not find some man in your party whose fidelity to the Government is unquestioned? Can you find no brave soldier to honor with your votes? Is the Democratic party so completely under the control of disloyal men, that you must select as your standard-bearer one whose heart is with the rebels, and whose arm would aid them if he could not render them more service here? [Applause.]

VALLANDIGHAM IN CONGRESS.

I have thus far only attended to the acts of Mr. Vallandigham for which he was arrested by Gen. Burnside, because this arrest undoubtedly induced this nomination. The leaders of this movement never would have ventured upon it but that they hoped to conceal his infamous record under a clamor about illegal arrests. They knew the sensitive jealousy of our people for the personal rights of the citizen, and under a pretense that these rights are in danger, they hope to conceal the political opinions of Mr. Vallandigham. I served as a member of Congress with him during his entire term. He was the intimate friend and associate, personal and political, of the leaders of this rebellion. You will look in vain for any word from him of reproof, discouragement or dissent to any act of theirs in the progress of this rebellion. He defended all the intrigues in Kansas. The reputed invasion by armed Missouri mobs—the frauds, violence, murder and crime with which these same rebels sought to overcome freemen in Kansas—the infamous

laws of a bogus Legislature—the attempt to establish a pro-slavery Constitution by election frauds—all these acts were defended and excused by him. He applauded and joined in the many threats of disunion uttered in both Houses of Congress before Mr. Lincoln was elected. During the memorable session that followed Mr. Lincoln's election, and when these rebels, encouraged by the imbecility of Mr. Buchanan, were seizing forts, armories, custom houses, killing and robbing our citizens, Mr. Vallandigham defended and excused them. He was with them in consultation, co-operated with them, was a party to all their plans, and encouraged them more than any other Northern man in acts of open war. *He was the first and the only man who formally proposed in Congress a substantial dissolution of the Union and the substitution of four Confederacies. When Major Anderson withdrew from Fort Moultrie and occupied Fort Sumter, Mr. Vallandigham was the only man from Ohio who voted "no" to a resolution of thanks to this gallant officer.* Up to the close of the 36th Congress, there was not a single act or declaration of Mr. Vallandigham's that was not approved by the leaders in this rebellion. The only difference afterward was that they took up arms boldly to overthrow the Government, while he availed himself of his position as a member of Congress from Ohio, to sap and undermine the authority of the Government, and thus more effectually aid the rebels than by sharing their dangers in the field.

When the extra session of Congress met in July 1861, party lines had disappeared, the people of the loyal States were acting heartily together in defence of the capital then beleaguered by hostile armies. Where was Mr. V. then? No political dispute about the conduct of the war had then arisen—when Crittenden and Johnson, Union men of the South and the North, Democrats of the South and the North were voting heartily together in founding measures of defence. What was then the course of Mr. Vallandham? He was active and spoke frequently, but not one word against the rebels then in arms around the Capitol, but arraignment after arraignment, accusation after accusation against the constituted authorities. The record will show that five men at this session were especially prominent in opposition to every measure of offence or defence. Breckinridge, of the Senate, and Burnett, Ben. Wood, Reid, Norton and Vallandigham, of the House. Since then Breckinridge, Reid and Burnett, have joined the rebel service, Wood cropped out the other day in the New York riots, and our Democratic friends propose to make the other Governor of Ohio. [Cries—"Shame, shame."] You will not find his vote recorded in favor of any measure of national defence or any appropriation for the support of the army. I have before me the record of the vote on the bill to authorize a national loan, taken on the 18th day of July, 1861. Those who voted in the negative on this important bill were Burnett, Norton, Reid, Wood and Vallandigham. Is not a man known by the company he keeps?

WHO DOES NOT SEE THE TRAITOR?

If any patriot had heretofore doubted the position of Mr. Vallandigham that doubt should be removed by his recent address from Canada. He commences by a pointed acknowledgment of the independence of Confederate States. He draws the line between the United States and the Confederate States as between two independent powers. Will the Democracy of Ohio make this acknowledgment? Are they willing to regard our soldiers as the invaders of an independent Government? But he says he refused to remain in the Confederate States, or identify himself with their cause, and thereby has proved his loyalty. What hypocrisy! *Do* we not know that he was received as a friend, feted, welcomed and released? Would any loyal citizens of the United States, have been thus treated? Is he not now acting as the agent and emissary of the rebel Government, in the very role marked out by them? Does he not issue his address from the very place, and in the very words they long since dictated? Is he not now advancing the cause more effectually than if he had taken his place by the side of Breckinridge and Davis? Read his address. He has no words of unkindness for the rebels seeking to subvert our Government. His invectives are only aimed at those who fight and strive for the Government. He tells you he has travelled more than a thousand miles through the rebel states, and met neither man, woman nor child, who would submit to the United States, as if any man, woman or child would confide in Vallandigham an opinion, sure to be joyfully betrayed to those who would hang the loyal man to the nearest tree. He dare not say but that thousands—yes, millions—would hail the old flag with shouts of joy; but he glories in the infamy that would bring to

him only malignant enemies of his country, and would drive from him, as from the stain of a leper, the loyal patriot of Tennessee, of North Carolina, or Virginia.

A TRAITOR'S ROAD TO PEACE.

But he tells us his road to peace, and this is the only material point of his address. He would withdraw what he calls invading armies. He would surrender Vicksburg, New Orleans, Memphis, Corinth, Kentucky, Western Virginia, the glorious battle fields of the war, the bones of thousands of brave men who lie buried there, martyrs for national unity. He would surrender the Union, cemented by the blood of our ancestors, and commence the wrangle and strife of insignificant fragments of a once glorious Union. Gentlemen, it is the advice of a traitor; and now, when the sunshine of victory has lightened with joy the hopes of all true patriots, it comes to us as the proclamation of Benedict Arnold to our fathers in the Revolution. Such a man Governor of Ohio! Such a man to marshal our militia—to be the commander of the heroes of Donelson, of Shiloh, of Murfreesboro, of Vicksburg—and that, too, by the voice of men who have been enriched by the peaceful pursuits of home, while their brothers have risked life, health, every thing in defense of them. Gentlemen, this is the delusion of politicians who have no faith in the intelligence or patriotism of the people. It is this class of men who regard the arrest of Vallandigham as the tyranny of King Bomba. I did hope that Mr. Pugh, who showed some indisposition at Charleston, would not be the mouthpiece of such trash. With those who, from the beginning, have been willing, like Mr. V., to allow the Union to be broken up, I have no discussion. Their candidate is well chosen. Their policy commences with disunion, and will, eventually, lead to border and civil wars here at home, until faction has exhausted the resources and spirit of our people, and they seek quiet under the protection of a king or emperor. If, however, we prosecute this war until all resistance to constituted authorities is overcome, we will have a lasting peace, upon the basis of the Union and Constitution. We will have demonstrated the power of a Republic to protect itself from internal enemies, and will enter upon a second stage of national existence, more glorious, more powerful, more hopeful, than even the past stages of our history. I would to God I could impress upon every man the magnitude of results depending upon this political contest in Ohio, as I feel them myself.

A QUESTION OF POLICY.

I know, fellow-citizens, that the great body of the Democrats of Ohio, are what are called war Democrats. They are opposed to the rebellion, wish to subdue it, and see no way but in vigorous, determined war. Why, then, is such a man as Vallandigham nominated for their support? The facts I have already stated show he did not agree with you in policy. How comes it then, that Peace Democrats, mostly old broken-down party leaders, have seized upon your political name, and now seek to commit you to the support of a convicted traitor? It is because the active and patriotic spirits of that party are far off in the presence of the enemy, or are quiet farmers and citizens, engaged in industrial pursuits. It is for you to say whether allegiance to party is stronger than allegiance to the country. The Union party has continually shown no narrow partisanship which should prevent any man from voting with them. It is true, it is composed mainly of Republicans, but all the nominees but one on the State ticket, voted against Mr. Lincoln. Mr. Brough is nominated solely because he is a gentlemen of great ability and experience, will stand by the Government in the prosecution of the war. He surrenders none of his political convictions. He is a War Democrat, and although I am a Republican, and would much prefer to vote for a man who belonged to that party and who agreed with me in all the tenets of that party, yet I shall vote for Mr. Brough simply because, though a Democrat, he will stand by the constituted authorities in suppressing this rebellion.

CHOOSE JOHN BROUGH.

I ask you when the chance is presented between Vallandigham and Brough, if every sentiment of patriotism, every feeling of manhood, the love of nationality, the honor of our brave soldiers, the cause of liberty and humanity, do not demand your vote for Mr. Brough?

But, fellow-citizens, I have already dwelt, perhaps, too long upon the personal aspect of this contest as presented by Mr. Pugh. The contest is between two political organizations, each of which have announced their principles and nominated their candidates. Remember it is not a contest between the Republican and the Democratic parties. The Republican party organization was voluntarily surrendered in June, 1861, in the hope to

unite the men of all parties in a hearty support of the war. I then regarded, and have ever since regarded, this surrender of the Republican organization as unwise and impolitic. Two opposing parties are indispensable in a free Government. They check each other and make issues which are from time to time decided by the people. Had the Republican and the Democratic organizations been preserved, both would probably have been loyal in a generous strife as to which could best maintain the Union, and in the healthy rivalry as to the best measures for that end, both would have been preserved in patriotic devotion to the Union and the Constitution. The administration would have been compelled to adopt a fixed policy, and the antagonism of a powerful and loyal party would have been a healthy check. By the abandonment of the Republican organization the Administration was left without a compact political support. Its measures lacked consistency, and vibrated from the surrender of slaves to rebel masters to the proclamation of universal emancipation. Men of the most diverse views were acting together without discipline or concert, and without a party name; while the name and organization of the old Democratic party drifted into the custody of men without a spark of patriotic sympathy for the Union or the Government. I blame no one for the surrender of the Republican organization. It was the impulse of a noble spirit, but it was a surrender of the best party, of the soundest principles, and the most honorable record in our political history. It was done to secure unity in a great cause. The Union party to which it gave way is founded upon the necessity of supporting the constituted authorities in a time of war. Its purpose, aim and end is to maintain the just authority of the United States in suppressing a great rebellion, and here is the marked distinction between the two parties. *The Union party strikes only at the rebels; the Democratic party strikes only at the Administration. The Union party insists upon the use of every means to put down the rebels. The Democratic party uses every means to put down the Administration.* I read what is called the Democratic platform, and I find nothing against the rebels who are in arms against the best Government in the world; but I find numerous accusations against the authorities of the Government, who are struggling to put down the rebels. I find no kindly mention of the progress of our arms; no mention of victories achieved and difficulties overcome; no mention of financial measures without a parallel in their success; no mention of support; no word of encouragement to the constituted authorities; no allowance made for human error, not a single patriotic hope. It is a long string of whining, scolding and accusation. It is dictated by the spirit of rebellion, and before God I believe it originated in the same malignant hate of the constituted authorities as has armed the public enemies. I appeal to you if that is the proper mode to support your Government in time of war. Is this the example set by Webster, Clay, and the great leaders of the Whig party, when General Jackson throttled nullification, or is it the example of the tories of the Revolution?

Without a well organized, powerful Government, able to put down all opposition, there can be no liberty. Liberty does not consist in license. It consists in the secure enjoyment of the privileges prescribed by the laws. It implies a hearty support of the Government in all measures necessary for its existence and security. Our liberty, all our privileges, are at stake in the attempt now made to overthrow the Government. We owe to this Government something besides the payment of taxes. Our duty is not completed by keeping out of the penitentiary, by simply not transgressing the criminal laws. We owe to the Government *allegiance*, hearty, cheerful and active. We should encourage and support the agents who have been chosen to perform the functions of the Government. A Copperhead may think his duty performed if he pays taxes with much grumbling; if he only talks treason and does not act it; if he criticises an officer and soldier, but is afraid to share their dangers; if he abuses and libels the President and all in authority; if he finds fault with all they do without the charity to admit their patriotism. To a Copperhead all the dangers that now threaten our national existence are materials for party criticism; with a patriot they only induce a firmer and more manly tread to the support of the Government, and to the aid of those citizens who have been chosen to uphold our flag or guide our counsels.

STEALING HEAVEN'S LIVERY TO SERVE THE DEVIL IN.

If I am correct, my friends, in my statement of the duty of a citizen, I ask you if you perform your duty by acting with a party that has no reproaches for the public enemy and no praise for its defenders? I know that the leaders endeavor to cloak

their movements under the name of the Democratic party; but mark it, whenever any member of that party proves himself prominently a patriot, he is denounced. [Applause.] Rosecrans was a Democrat and is a hero and a patriot. [Applause.] What do these malignants say of him? That he is one of "Lincoln's hirelings and minions." Burnside was a Democrat, and is a brave, modest and excellent general. [Cheers.] But what do they say of him? He is a "tyrant" and a "despot;" he arrested Vallandigham; he trampled upon the rights—the most sacred rights—of a citizen by arresting a malefactor. Butler was a Democrat—a Breckinridge, simon-pure Democrat—but has proved himself a wise, sagacious, able commander. What do they say of him? He is a "beast;" he would not allow the women of New Orleans to insult his soldiers. He compelled the chivalry of Louisiana to obey the laws. [Cheers.] Andrew Johnston was a Democrat, but when Davis, Toombs and the leading rebels undertook to subvert this Government by war and secession he denounced them, and leaving wife, children, property and friends—presenting an example of patriotism and fidelity almost without example—has fought the good fight with unswerving firmness. [Cheers.] What do these men say of him? He has turned "Abolitionist;" "he is no better than Garrison Phillips." Thousands of Democrats have won immortal honor in this war. [Applause.] Some of them have sealed their devotion with their blood; but, living or dead, in body or in spirit, they appeal to you with united voices to lay aside your party affinities and unite to maintain the Government of your fathers. [loud applause.]

WHOM COPPERHEADS PRAISE.

Turn again to these "leaders." Of whom do they speak kindly? Did they say any thing of the infamy, of the crime, committed by these rebels in attempting to overthrow the best Government in the World? They were wrong—yes, they were wrong—taking up arms was an irregular opposition to the Government: but the words of censure vaulted into praise. It was only Mr. Lincoln and the officers of our Government and the agents of our people upon whom fell defamation, sarcasm, ridicule. They by whose agencies alone under the guidance of Almighty God the Union can be preserved, were "tyrants" and "despots." Vallandigham is their hero! Fernando Wood, covered with the mantle of crime is their saint! Is the language and conduct of these men such as a loyal citizen should render to his Government in a time of war, of sore distress, when all the power of the nation is needed to overcome armed foes in the field?

AN APPEAL FROM THE SOLDIERS.

My friends, those who are absent from us, and in the presence of the enemy, can best judge of those partisan efforts to divide us here in the North. We hear but one view from the army—from officers and soldiers—from Republican and Democrat. It is an earnest demand for us to cease our disputes and support the constituted authorities. And now when they have brought us victory, when the army of Gen. Banks has restored to the nation Port Hudson, when Gen. Grant has taken Vicksburg and Jackson; when Rosecrans has pursued Bragg into Georgia: when Meade has driven Lee back from a boasted march to Philadelphia and New York with a loss of half his army; when Burnside, aided by home militia, has taken the horse-thief Morgan, and all his fast riders—is this the time to talk of electing Vallandigham Governor of Ohio? [Voices, "no."] No, no, my friends, let us give him to Queen Victoria or the Emperor Napoleon; let us drive the leaders of this rebellion, of whom he is one, into perpetual banishment [cheers] or the bazaars around the courts of kings, queens and emperors. Let us save all our honors for those who have been true to their flag and country when they were threatened both with overthrow. Let us seek peace as it can now only be honorably won by the overthrow of public enemies. Let us stand by each other and the constituted authorities until all within the bounds of our country shall either submit willingly or be compelled to submit to the Constitution and the laws. Then the labor of a single generation of men will wipe out all the losses and sacrifices of this war, and the Great Republic will tread again its unexampled march of progress and liberty. [Applause.]

And now my friends, in conclusion, I ask you when you go home to discuss this among yourselves. Do not be deceived by false pretenses; and think ten thousand times before you vote for a traitor for Governor of Ohio. [Long continued applause.]

Daily Journal Print, Dayton.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 011 896 943 1